



PROPOSAL EVALUATION

IRWM Grant Program – Planning Grant, Round 2, FY 2011-2012

Applicant	Sequoia Riverlands Trust	County	Tulare & Fresno
Project Title	Southern Sierra Integrated Regional Water Management Planning Grant	Grant Request	\$ 610,738
		Total Project Cost	\$ 854,498

Project Description The objective of this proposal is to fund the development of an Integrated Regional Water Management Plan (Plan) for the Southern Sierra Integrated Regional Water Management Region, a region that does not currently have an IRWM Plan. This Plan will fully comply with the Proposition 84 Guidelines and Standards and will affirmatively address the objectives developed by the regional stakeholders during the Plan development process. The Plan will include regional projects and programs that will increase coordination among federal, state and local agencies, as well as non-governmental organizations (NGOs), disadvantaged communities (DACs), tribes, and other stakeholders within the Southern Sierra region. This Plan will also help foster communication and coordination with the neighboring IRWM regions.

Evaluation Summary

Scoring Criterion	Score
Work Plan	9
DAC Involvement	10
Schedule	4
Budget	6
Program Preferences	5
Tie Breaker	0
Total Score	34

- **Work Plan** The criterion is less than fully addressed and documentation is insufficient. The Applicant does not adequately characterize the “current status in meeting IRWM standards,” which should be detailed in Section 1 of Work Plan although some work has already been completed (\$146,880 of work completed to date). There are some slight inconsistencies between tasks described in the Work Plan and those in the Budget and Schedule. For instance, the Work Plan does not include sub-tasks for Task 14 or Task 17, but these tasks are included in the Budget Table and Schedule, respectively. Tasks 6 and 14 contain only vague descriptions of what this work entails. Also, work that is being claimed as “Pre-Application Submission Match” in the Budget (\$146,880 titled: Pre-Application Submission Match 2008-2010 and 2011-2012) is not included in the Work Plan, as required.
- **DAC Involvement** The criterion is fully addressed and supported by thorough and well-presented documentation and logical rationale. Task 13.5 is “Increase Outreach to DACs.” This task includes the identification of DAC areas, a DAC needs assessment, the development of a process to ensure DAC needs are addressed and incorporated in the Plan and planning process, and the development of a process for DAC outreach that includes meetings, workshops, educational materials, and technical assistance with initial project planning. A DAC Outreach Plan is included under this Task as a deliverable. Additionally, DACs (needs and/or involvement) will also be addressed under Task 3 (Plan Objectives) and Task 10 (Finance Plan). Additionally, as described in Task 13.2 and 13.3 (RWMG Group Meetings and Develop and Implement Issue-Specific Workshops, respectively), travel stipends will be offered to DAC representatives to encourage participation in RWMG meetings and workshops. Further, Attachment 4, Budget, identifies that 6% of the funding will go towards DAC needs. The schedule provides a timeline of planning for DAC’s needs.



PROPOSAL EVALUATION

IRWM Grant Program – Planning Grant, Round 2, FY 2011-2012

- **Schedule** The criterion is fully addressed but is not supported by thorough documentation or sufficient rationale. The Schedule does not include a date or timeline for RWMG adoption of IRWM Plan. Plan adoption date should be indicated, or, if after the end date of the grant agreement, an explanation provided as to how the RWMG will ensure the IRWM Plan will be adopted. There are some inconsistencies between tasks identified in the Schedule and those in the Work Plan and Budget table. For example, “Finalize Plan” is identified as task 16 in the Work Plan; however, this task is absent from the Schedule (the Schedule does incorrectly reference task 16 as “Website,” which should be identified as task 17, according to the Work Plan.
- **Budget** The criterion is less than fully addressed and rationales are incomplete and insufficient. Applicant provides a Budget Table, explanatory text, and detailed budget tables that indicate labor categories, hourly rates and labor time estimates. A breakdown of the Applicant’s funding match and requested grant funds is generally indicated, as budget line item estimates. However, the Budget Table does not include a detailed break-down of Pre-Application Work already completed (\$146,880), which is the majority of the total cost-share being claimed. Two detailed budget tables are provided (Match 2011-2012, and Match 2008-2010) which indicate on a very general level, the cost-break down of about \$114,000 of the \$146,880 being proposed as cost-share. However, \$32,480 is merely indicated as “Consultants In-Kind Services 2011-2012”, without any supporting information provided. The basis by which the Applicant estimates the agency’s own costs were not found. The Budget Table (1 of 4) appears to have discrepancies with the table titled *Southern Sierra Integrated Regional Water Management Plan – Consultant/Planning Firm Budget Estimate*, as there is no Task 18 (Grant Management, Administration and Reporting) on this table, and Task 16 and 17 do not agree with this budget table or with the Work Plan or Schedule.
- **Program Preference** The proposal sufficiently documents that 14 of the 15 program preferences will be met.
- **Tie Breaker** Not Applicable.